DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 488 CS 010 192

AUTHOR Tobia, Susan; Howard, Joseph
TITLE How To Strengthen a Faculty Development Program: Before, During, and After.
PUB DATE 9 May 90
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (35th, Atlanta, GA, May 6-11, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Content Area Reading; Critical Reading; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Learning Strategies; Program Descriptions; Study Skills; *Teacher Improvement; Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Community College of Philadelphia PA

ABSTRACT

In the early summer of 1988, 12 faculty members from 7 different departments of the Community College of Philadelphia participated in a faculty development program called the Summer Content Institute. The faculty members chose to take part because each wanted to revise a course which would be taught in the fall and to integrate into this course instructional strategies to enrich critical reading and writing. The institute was conducted like a seminar, meeting three days a week, four hours a day, for seven weeks. During these sessions, the participants were presented with selected instructional strategies to improve reading and writing skills of their students; became acquainted with the relevant research; were guided into a reconsideration of the goals of their courses; reviewed the course curricula they had revised; and were guided as they tried out some of the activities they developed. While this took a good deal of time and effort, the organizers of the institute came to realize that the activities which preceded and followed the series of meetings were also important and crucial to the success of the whole project. (Ten tables consisting of seminar materials are included; 29 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322488

HOW TO STRENGTHEN A FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER

Paper presented at the Thirty-fifth Annual Convention
International Reading Association
Atlanta, Georgia 9 May 1990

Presenters:

Susan Tobia, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Learning Lab
Community College of Philadelphia
1700 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130
(215) 751-8478

Joseph Howard, Ed.D.
Associate Professor, Learning Lab
Community College of Philadelphia
1700 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130
(215) 751-8929

CS010198

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susan Tobia, Ph.D.
Joseph Howard, Ed.D.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the early summer of 1988, twelve faculty members from seven different departments participated with us in a faculty development program called the Summer Content Institute. The faculty members chose to take part because each wanted to revise a course which would be taught in the fall and to integrate into this revised course instructional strategies to enrich critical reading and writing. In the Institute, there were two participants from the Sociology Department, three from the Justice Department, two from Early Childhood Education, three from the Psychology Department, and one each from Computer Studies and Dietetics. Even though the participants represented so many different departments, they developed a spirit of comaraderie and evaluated each other's work with a sense of honesty and collegiality.

The core of the Institute was conducted during May and June 1988. We conducted the Institute like a seminar and met three days a week, Tuesday to Thurday, four hours a day, for seven weeks. During this time, we planned and coordinated twenty-one meetings in which we presented the faculty with selected instructional strategies to improve the reading and writing skills of their students, acquainted them with some of the relevant research, guided them in a re-consideration of the goals of their courses, reviewed the course curricula which they had revised, and guided them as

they tried out some of the activities they developed. While this took a good deal of time and effort, we came to realize that the activities which preceded and followed this series of meetings, the "before" and "after" that sandwiched the "during," were also important and crucial to the success of the whole project.

THE BEFORE STAGE

In February 1988, four full months before the Summer Content Institute began, we started to prepare. While we had a general idea of what we would accomplish in the Institute — we would promote reading and writing instruction in the classroom and enable each participant to revise his/her course — we also wanted to share more specific goals with the participants and to incorporate the faculty members into the planning of the Institute.

We were acquainted with most of the faculty, but our contacts with them were usually superficial since we worked on a large campus and had such different schedules. In order to get to know the faculty and to identify their individual needs and priorities, we arranged to meet with each one individually. We explained the purpose of the Summer Content Institute and used the questions in Table1 to elicit some information which

Table 1

Interview Questions with Faculty

1. What do you see as the purpose of your course?

2. Who are the students?

3. With what concepts do students have difficulty?

4. What are your current instructional strategies?

5. What is your means of evaluating student performance?

6. Describe your dissatisfaction (if any) with the course.

7. What are your expectations of this faculty development institute?

8. Other

Syllabus ___

Texts ___

would enable the teachers to become involved in the planning. We spent about an hour with each faculty member, talking over the course and the teacher's perception of problems and strengths. In our conversations, we were pleased with the openness and honesty of the teachers and their responses gave us a good idea of topics to be stressed.

After we finished all twelve interviews, we summarized the responses and tried to identify common or recurring concerns. When we reviewed the summaries of the talks, we noted that most of the teachers were teaching survey courses, usually an introductory course. As a result, they felt that there was a certain amount of content to cover. They said that their students were very diverse in their academic abilities and, besides a need to improve their reading and writing abilities, the students often could not synthesize what they had learned or apply their knowledge to new or different situations. The teachers wanted to involve their students in the classes, but the students often were characterized as passive. Lectures were the most frequently used method of instruction.

After identifying the common concerns, we wrote up a plan of activities for the seven-week workshop. See Table 2. Some of the topics, such as improving critical reading and writing, were repeated throughout the Institute. This plan was distributed to the partitipants at a meeting during

Table 2

Sequential Outline for Summer Institute

Week 1

- Introduction
- Concepts
- Content classroom selection
- Subconcepts
- Prior knowledge - PReP
- Semantic mapping
- Schema theory

Week 2

- Overview of writing
- Holistic scoring guide
- Types of writing assignments
- Active Learning

Week 3

- Comprehensibility
- Organizational structure
- Modeling
- Monitoring, verbalization

Week 4

- Effective lectures
- Peer learning
- Small group instruction
- Content specific writing manuals
- Metacognition

Week 5

- Demonstration
- Questions
- Recapitulation of concepts for curriculum
- Synthesis, application, judgment in reading

Week 6

- Content in depth (Thought-Provoking Curriculum)
- Synthesis, application, judgment in writing
- Evaluation

Week 7

- Sharing of curricula
- Evaluation of institute & Plans for fall

the College's final exam week. This meeting gave the participants an opportunity to look over the plan for the Institute and to let us know if they wanted more or less time spent on some topics. If they did, we would have about three weeks before the Institute began to make any changes. The meeting also gave the teachers a chance to meet each other. Some of them were acquainted since they were from the same department, but often they did not know their colleagues from different disciplines.

Before the Summer Content Institute even began, each of the faculty taking part had had an opportunity to contribute to the planning of the Institute and their concerns were incorporated into the list of activities. We included them in the planning of the Institute by spending about an hour discussing the Institute with them, by considering their needs when writing up a list of activities and selecting materials, and by giving them an idea of the scope and sequence of the Institute even before it began. We also used this "before" time to encourage the participants to meet some of the other faculty who would be taking part in the Institute. We wanted the group to work with each other, and so it was important that they knew each other.

It seemed that this time devoted to the preparation of the affective element of the Institute was helpful and led to the formation and

maintenance of a teaching/learning community during the seven weeks of the Institute and beyond. Participants were willing to share ideas and critique each other's work, and this was done in an atmosphere of friendliness and honesty.

THE DURING STAGE

The Concept Guide

The major objective of the Institute was the revision of a course. Since twelve faculty members from seven different disciplines were rewriting their courses, we needed a uniform but flexible way for each faculty member to begin and complete this revision. In order to guide them on this task, we developed the Concept Guide. See Table 3.

When using this guide, the instructor first selected a topic which would be taught in the course and then identified the concepts which made up this topic. The next step was to consider these concepts carefully, trying to answer such questions as, Why is the concept important? What skills will students need to be taught in order to learn these concepts? Finally, the instructor had to consider strategies, materials, etc., which would enable students to learn these concepts. Since the Institute stressed the development of reading and writing abilities, these were highlighted. But

Table 3

Concept Development – A Working Guide

Selected content topic:

Concepts to be developed within the topic:

Analysis of concepts - (Why is the concept important? What will students need to know to learn the concept? What critical thinking skills will be developed? Can the concepts be arranged according to subtopics? Is a hierarchy of concepts evident?)

Tools for teaching concepts -

Reading Strategies/Assignments:

Table 3 (continued)

Writing Strategies/Assignments:

Materials:

Environment - (What is an appropriate and effective one?)

Evaluation of concepts - (How will I know if students have learned them?
How do they fit in with overall purpose of course?)

the faculty member also had to consider the format for teaching the concepts and how student learning would be evaluated.

The use of the Concept Guide also forced the instructors to reconsider some of the assumptions about their courses which they had acquired over the years. By examining each topic carefully, they were able to consider just how important some of these topics really were. Many of the instructors taught introductory courses, and so they often felt that they had to cover quite a bit of material. It was possible, however, that they could perhaps examine a few selected topics in depth rather than just skim through a long list of topics. By separating the course into a series of topics and concepts, and writing up a Concept Guide for each topic, it was likely that the instructors might realize that they were trying to cover more than was realistic.

The participants used the Concept Guide throughout the Institute. They reviewed completed Concept Guides with each other about every other week and they used the guides as the basis for their course revisions.

PReP

Background of information has been shown to be a significant factor in learning. Teachers were often concerned about their students' lack of background knowledge, but at a community college with an older student

body, teachers were at times surprised at what their students knew about certain topics. One way to develop the students' background of information, and also find out what students already knew, was to use the instructional strategy called PReP, developed by J. Langer.

The first step of PReP is to ask students to think of what a certain key word means. The instructor then asks for responses and writes the responses, along with the initials of the student's name, on the board. In the second step of PReP, the teacher can refer to this list and ask each student what made him or her think of this response. Finally, after elaboration from students, the teacher can ask the students what has been added to their knowledge of this term.

PReP helps indicate where the instructor should begin teaching and helps to identify students who might need additional assistance. It also allows the students to learn from each other and encourages them to become involved and think about the topic.

In the Institute, the dietetics teacher demonstrated PReP with the term "carbohydrate." This term was not unknown to us, but we were unfamiliar with its scientific significance. PReP allowed us to learn more and recognize some of our misconceptions about this word. The participants liked this technique quite a bit.

Microthemes

In our interviews with faculty before the Institute began, we noted that the participants expressed dissatisfaction with the writing abilities of their students. It appeared that many of the instructors relied on one large research paper which was to be handed in at the end of the semester, and they usually found that these term papers were disappointing in content and form. Consequently, we decided to stress shorter writing assignments as an alternative to the term paper.

One alternative we presented was the microtheme. A microtheme is a short assignment, but it is not necessarily a simple assignment. A microtheme can require that a student reflect on a topic, synthesize data, and write his or her response in a paragraph or short paper which is unified, coherent, and mechanically correct. A list of typical microtheme topics is listed in Table 4. The teachers responded very favorably to the microtheme, and they devised some good assignments which were included in their revised curricula.

Holistic scoring

The use of the microtheme fits in well with a new approach to correcting papers. Since the microtheme was short, it needed a simple, quick way to be evaluated. The teachers commented that they avoided frequent writing

Table 4

Microthemes

Based on article "Microtheme Strategies for Developing Cognitive Skills" by John C. Bean, Dean Drenk, and F. D. Lee in New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Teaching Writing in All Disciplines, edited by G. W. Griffin. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

A microtheme is a short essay, perhaps as short as one paragraph, which can be easily graded.

1. Summary Microtheme: Write a summary of an article, or of two articles with opposing points of view.

Example: You are the dietetic technician at Well Baby Clinic. You have been asked by the clinic director to write a brief article for the clinic's monthly newsletter on infant feeding - specifically introducing "Solids" into a baby's diet. Write a 1 page article on the above which utilizes the information from pages 512-518 in your text.

2. Thesis Support Microtheme: Take a point of view and explain and/or defend.

Example: To what extent do you find Austin's explanation of the loss of Odysseus' sailors on the Island of the Sun consistent with your reading of the story?

3. Data Microtheme: Derive a thesis from data presented in sentences or in graph or table form.

Example: Given a table of death rates for various diseases, try to explain the changes in death rates from various causes over the past 50 years.

4. Quandry Microtheme: Present a case history or problem and ask for a written solution.

Example: What do you see as the biggest transportation problem for older adults? Why do you say so? What do you suggest we do to deal with the problem?

assignments because of the time involved in correcting papers. Teachers felt that they had to correct everything, but they also weren't sure that this conscientious attention to detail was producing the desired results. They reported a few anecdotes of students who were just interested in the paper's grade, not in any of the teacher's comments. In order to give the participants a reliable and quick way to correct the microthemes, we presented holistic scoring.

When using holistic scoring, the evaluator reads a paper through once and compares the paper to a list of standards. The reader does not mark errors, suggest revisions, or make comments. He or she just notes if the paper meets certain criteria and gives it one grade, usually a number on a scale from 1 to 6. In order to demonstrate the efficacy of this method, we distributed a holistic scoring guide and some representative essays. Using holistic scoring, we scored each of the essays individually and then compared our results. When we looked at the scores awarded by each member of the group, we found that we gave about the same score to each paper. Once the participants saw how the system worked, they were anxious to write up their own guides. A sample of a holistic scoring guide for papers in a mental health/social service course can be seen in Table 5. In this guide, each paper is expected to show common features, such as

Table 5

Generic Evaluation Guide for Writing Assignments, MHSS 171

Five point scale with 5 elements in each level. The student will be scored at the level in which he/she scores at least 3 of the 5 points in that level.

5 points - Quality of thinking: responds to assignments in excellent way
Well organized and developed
Consistent use of appropriate vocabulary
Demonstrates application and consistently uses examples
Excellent use of standard grammar, punctuation and spelling

4 points - Quality of thinking: response stated directly
Organized and/or developed
Some use of appropriate vocabulary
Some application and/or use of examples
Good use of standard grammar, punctuation and spelling

3 points - Quality of thinking: response stated but not very directly
Some organization and/or development
Occasional use of appropriate vocabulary
Occasional application and/or use of examples
Fair use of standard grammar, punctuation and spelling

2 points - Quality of thinking: response only hinted at
Little organization or development
Little use of appropriate vocabulary
Little application and/or examples
Poor grammar, punctuation and spelling

1 point - Quality of thinking: does not respond to assignment
No organization or development
No appropriate vocabulary
No application of example
Communication obscured by poor grammar, punctuation and spelling

David Ishizaki, Community College of Philadelphia, 1988

organization and use of examples. Good papers differ from poor papers in that the good papers are better organized and consistently use examples. The guide is also shared with students so they will have an idea of what is expected.

Some questions still arose, however, about ways to help students improve their writing. While the instructors might be able to grade papers holistically, some students will still ask for guidance on their writing. A few strategies were suggested. One was the use of a "model" paper which could be copied and distributed. Another was the use of a teacher-student conference to go over the paper in detail. The tutors and faculty of the Learning Lab, a student assistance center at Community College of Philadelphia, were also available to help students improve their writing.

DRTA

As the Institute drew to a close, we introduced the participants to the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity, or DRTA. This instructional technique incorporated a number of the attitudes about learning and activities which had already been presented.

An outline for a DRTA is given in Table 6. The readiness section of the DRTA uses PReP and the microtheme, activities which had been presented earlier, and encourages students to learn from each other, an approach

Table 6

Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) for the College Classroom

Not all of the activities listed under each step would be done in any one class. The alternatives are given for your selection.

Step 1: **READINESS**

- Review previous class, if appropriate.

- Choose a particular concept from the reading and PReP to assess and build background knowledge.

- Pose a statement for reaction. Statement could be puzzling, inflammatory, controversial, etc.

- Share written responses of students to pre-study questions or to microtheme assignments.

- Use semantic map (student- or teacher-constructed) to focus on organization and integration of ideas.

- Caution students to be on the lookout for particular issues or problem areas in the reading.

- Develop pertinent vocabulary.

Step 2: **PURPOSE FOR READING**

- Based on their survey of the material (for a text chapter — introduction, skim, summary), have students note their expectations of what the text will be about and what they would like to find out.

- Student or teacher poses question or problem.

Step 3: **READING**

IN-CLASS (To be used at the beginning of semester particularly)

- Stop at designated places in the text (teacher decides ahead of time where it makes sense to do so) and have students summarize in the margins.

- Some students share summaries aloud. (Other students get to see what fellow classmates consider important.)

- Discuss particular selection if elaboration or clarification seems needed. (New purposes for reading further may result from this.) Discussion may require reference to text for closer reading.

- Teacher and students exchange questions about the material. (Teacher models good questions; students reciprocate.) Questions may require rereading of pieces of text to provide support for answers.

- Determine if purposes for reading have been met.

OUTSIDE CLASS (Students begin to internalize what they have seen teacher and other students model.)

- Students use SQ3R strategy.

- Students may use teacher-prepared study guide to guide reading.

- Students write summaries of subsections of text.

- Students design semantic map.

- Students compose questions to be shared with class. (Questions may refer to something that was not understood.)

Part 4: **FOLLOW-UP**

- Orally summarize main points of class reading and discussion.

- Use written microthemes to synthesize, evaluate, apply what has been learned.

- Use collaborative writing groups to respond to a particular thought-provoking issue.

- Read supplementary material on the topic and write briefly what was understood or not understood. Make connections to previously read material.

which was stressed during the Institute. Since some of the reading is done in class, the teacher can model "college" reading behavior, which may include pausing to review, rereading, summarizing, and questioning. Students may often be under the false assumption that all college readers are adept, and that a good reader shouldn't pause, reflect, or question. If this sort of behavior is modelled in the class, then the students are more likely to internalize this behavior when they do their reading outside of the classroom.

Think Alouds

The DRTA was intended to develop good reading, but some students still might not realize how a good reader handles the text. The Think Aloud was a way for the student to realize that reading may involve backing up, predicting, and raising questions.

In the Institute, the teachers used the guidelines on Table 7 to practice a Think Aloud. They had a fairly difficult time going beyond the content of the passage. Many of them were able to summarize what they were reading, but they were not as comfortable reflecting on their thought processes as they read. They were encouraged to show their confusion about some passages and to explain how they tried to figure them out.

In subsequent classes, some teachers used Think Alouds to help their

Table 7

Instructions for Think-Alouds

READER/REFLECTOR

Read silently one sentence at a time. Then say what you are doing and thinking about as you try to understand that sentence. After you have told everything you are thinking, go on to the next sentence. At this point, you are telling what you are thinking about two sentences, and then three, and so on — kind of news bulletins or play-by-play acocunts of where you are intellectually as you figure out what the reading is about.

If you have any trouble understanding, tell about that, too — what you are doing and thinking to try to figure out what's puzzling you. Don't hesitate to say anything that comes to your mind.

After you have read and thought out loud for 15 minutes, reflect awhile, if you like, and then tell your sense of what the passage was about. You can refer back to the passage, if you wish, but try to recall the basic ideas that you came up with in your own words.

RECORDER

You will have a copy of the passage being used by the Reader/Reflector. Following along with the Reader/Reflector, make notes about his thinking — what intellectual moves he seems to be making, comments about the passage, interactions with it, or whatever. You should not respond to the R/R, except to ask him to speak up or to remind him to say what he is thinking.

LISTENER/OBSERVER

Your job is to listen and observe, so that at the completion of the think-aloud, you may make comments about what you saw happening.

****

After 15 minutes of reading and reflecting, the three participants should discuss what they noted — what kinds of thinking moves were demonstrated, how the reader dealt with problems in the text, what strategies he employed, how the think-aloud might help students to be aware of what an expert reader does with expository text.

THEN SWITCH ROLES AND REPEAT THE PROCESS

Adapted from Susan Lytle. (1982). Exploring comprehension style: A study of twelfth grade readers' transactions with text. Ann Arbor: Universtiy Microfilms.

students recognize and internalize the habits of good readers. They did not follow the outline as presented, but usually opted to read a section out loud and model for the students their own thought processes as they tried to understand what they were reading. They reported that students got a lot out of this exercise.

Study Guides

In our discussion of reading, it became obvious that teachers saw that their students needed to improve their study skills and abilities to comprehend what they read. Study guides were presented as a way to improve students' skills, but some of the teachers were familiar with commercial study guides, and they were unhappy with them since they seemed so routine. In order to give the teachers the means to develop students' reading and studying abilities, two approaches, one labelled directed and the other independent, for the development of a study guide were presented. See Table 8.

One of the characteristics of student learning which the Institute was concerned with was the development of student autonomy. If students were always to follow someone else's directions, they would probably not learn to think for themselves. Consequently, the outline for study guides was composed so that it listed two sets of activities, those which the

Table 8

Study Guides

DIRECTED	INDEPENDENT
Vocabulary	
• Instructor lists words which reader should know	• Reader selects words which seem to be important
• Instructor provides skeleton for semantic map of critical terms	• Reader constructs own semantic map of designated critical terms
Organization	
• Instructor provides sample of annotated text	• Reader develops own system of marking and annotating text
• Instructor provides incomplete outline, to be completed by reader	• Reader writes own outline of text
Comprehension	
• Instructor asks varying types of questions	• Reader makes up own questions
• Instructor provides statements for acceptance or rejection, based on text	• Reader changes chapter headings into questions and answers same
• Instructor presents problem, to be solved by reading	• Reader summarizes what was read
• Instructor lists critical concepts: reader finds evidence for support	• Reader identifies own critical concepts from text
• Instructor asks students to evaluate what was read	• Reader responds to reading in a journal format
Reflection	
• Instructor indicates reaction to text	• Reader indicates reaction to text

instructor could write up, under the heading "directed," and those which the student could develop, under the heading "independent." The guide implies depth since study reading consists of a range of topics, from vocabulary development to reflection, and also allows flexibility since for each topic there is a range of activities from which the teacher or student can choose.

Since the development of student autonomy was so crucial, the independent study guide was expanded through the handout on comprehension monitoring. See Table 9. This guide offers students a framework for approaching text. They are reminded to establish a purpose for reading and to evaluate their comprehension. Again, some recurring topics show up. The students are encouraged to examine their own background of knowledge before reading. This time, however, rather than relying on PReP, they have to question themselves. While reading, the students are expected to be actively engaged and to monitor their own comprehension. If they have difficulty, then they need to develop their own remediation strategies.

THE AFTER STAGE

When we held the last meeting of the Institute in late June, we realized

Table 9

Comprehension Monitoring Guide for Students

General questions to ask before reading:

- Why am I reading this?
- What do I already know about this topic?
- What do I want to know about this topic?
- What should I know when I finish reading?
- How will I test myself?

While reading:

- Stop periodically and check to see if I am understanding what I have read. Do this by paraphrasing, questioning myself, or summarizing in my own words.
- Make notes to myself in the margins and underline ideas that seem important.

Some problems I may encounter:

- Trouble understanding particular words
- Trouble understanding particular sentences
- Trouble understanding the relation between sentences
- Trouble understanding how different pieces of the text fit together

Most readers run into these types of problems. Perhaps they are unfamiliar with the topic, perhaps the text is confusing, or perhaps they do not have enough background knowledge to help them figure out the important ideas.

Some fix-up strategies for me to try:

- Ignore and read on. If this does not work, I may be missing too much that is important.
- Change my rate of reading. I may need to go slower to give my mind a chance to think about what I am reading.
- Reread.
- Put my judgment on hold. Maybe what I do not understand right now will be cleared up later in the text.
- Make a guess. See if it works out as I read on.
- Go to an expert. Use this as a last resort, but do it if I need to.

References: Pitts, M. (1983). Comprehension monitoring: Definition and practice. Journal of Reading, 26, 516-523.

Weinstein, C. E. & Rogers, B. T. (1985). Comprehension monitoring: The neglected learning strategy. Journal of Developmental Education, 9, 6-29.

that the materials developed during the past seven weeks and the revised course curricula would not be effective unless we had plans to maintain contact with the participants and support them as they incorporated some of the strategies they had developed during the Institute. In order to keep in touch, we stressed three things: a student evaluation of the revised courses, periodic meetings, and classroom visits.

Before the Institute concluded, the participants wrote up a four-page evaluation for the students to complete. It asked them to evaluate the content of the course, the reading and writing assignments, the format in which the course was taught, and the effect on the student. The responses were recorded on a Likert scale, and there was also the opportunity to write in comments. See Table 10.

This evaluation was given out in both the fall and spring semesters, and in some classes it was given twice, at mid-term as a formative evaluation and at the end of the semester as a summative evaluation. In the fall, there were 138 evaluations completed from nine classes at the end of the fall semester.

From a review of the evaluations, it appeared that the students thought that they had learned a good deal of information, had also learned a lot about a few special topics, and felt that they were prepared for the next

Table 10
Student Course Evaluation

Intructor's Name _____ Course _____ Date _____

Please evaluate the intstruction in this course by putting a mark in the space next to the word(s) which correspond to your feelings about each statement.

Content

1. I learned a good deal of information in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

2. I feel that I am prepared for another course in this subject.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

3. I feel that I learned a lot about a few special topics in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

Other _____
_____

Reading

4. I did a good deal of meaningful reading in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

5. I got more out of the reading assignments in this course than I have gotten out of reading assignments in other courses.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

6. The reading assignments in this course were linked to the other course activities, such as lectures, class discussions, and writing assignments.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

7. My vocabulary increased in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

8. I was able to understand the textbook used in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

Other _____
_____

Writing

9. I did a good deal of writing in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

10. The writing assignments were returned quickly.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

11. I understood the scoring criteria used for my writing assignments.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

12. The writing assignments in this course made me think.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

13. The writing assigments helped me understand the course better.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

Other _____
_____

Environment

14. The lectures in this course were interesting and informative.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

15. The class discussions were stimulating and made me think. _ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

16. I thought that it was worthwhile to work in small groups.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

17. I learned from the comments of other students.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

18. I learned from other class experiences, such as class trips, guest lecturers, etc.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

Other _____
_____

Table 10 (continued)

Student Autonomy

19. This course helped me to learn new information on my own.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

20. I am more aware of my strengths and weaknesses as a learner.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

21. I have had to think deeply in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

22. I have applied what I have learned in this course to different situations.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

23. In the beginning, I felt unsure about myself in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

24. I still feel unsure about myself in this course.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

Other _____
_____

Instructor

25. The instructor is knowledgeable about his/her subject.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

26. The instructor asks questions which make me think.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

27. The instructor respects me as an adult learner.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

28. The instructor is enthusiastic about his/her subject.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

29. I would take another course with this instructor.
_ Strongly agree _ Agree _ Disagree _ Strongly disagree _ Not applicable

Other _____
_____

30. What changes would you suggest to improve this course?

Choose one of the following and answer in a paragraph. You may use the back of this page, if you wish.

1. Did this course differ from other courses you have taken at CCP? Please explain.

2. What changes will this course have on you as a learner, now or in the future? Please explain.

course. A good amount of reading was required and the students seemed to feel that they were able to understand the texts used. The students usually indicated that the writing assignments were returned quickly and that they understood the scoring criteria. They thought that the writing assignments made them think. Students seemed to have confidence in their abilities to learn and felt that they had to apply what they had learned. For the most part, no changes were suggested by students for the courses, but they commented that the classes seemed to be intellectually stimulating. Some students reported that their confidence and knowledge increased and that they had applied what they learned to other courses.

The evaluations were an indication of student attitudes, but we also wanted to maintain teacher attitudes. The participants had developed a number of new materials and practiced some new strategies. We knew that some of these strategies might not work as well in the classroom as they had in the Institute, and the teachers might be frustrated and tempted to revert to old styles of instruction. Consequently, we scheduled two meetings during the fall semester, 1988. For each meeting, we had prepared a topic which we could discuss, but we spent a good deal of time reviewing and considering what the teachers reported that they had done in their classes. One teacher, from experience, cautioned not to try too

many new strategies at once. It takes time for students to really "try on" a strategy and feel comfortable with it, and it wasn't advisable to overwhelm them with too much at one time. We had another meeting in the spring of 1989 and have continued on an informal basis since.

We also visited classes and observed and talked with teachers about what we saw. In some classes, we became participants in small group activities. Sometimes we modelled a particular strategy. The critical thing was that we maintained our support and interest.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the Institute in its finite terms, seven weeks, was valuable. It was a time for learning strategies, trying out ideas, getting collegial feedback, and revisings. It was a time to think silently and out loud, to develop curricular ideas, and to consider implications. However, also critical to its success were the pre- and post-activities. The pre-activities involved discussion with and among faculty, dictated the seven-week agenda, and established expectations. Faculty had a stake in the outcome. The post-activities, critical to the long-term impact, provided opportunities to replenish enthusiasm, to get relevant feedback, and to create new ideas. The comaraderie established during the Institute was not lost. As one

participant remarked, "The Institute may be over, but we are not leaving." And they didn't. Even though the contractual agreement ended at the close of the spring semester, participants still interact informally, asking each other for suggestions, sharing interesting articles, visiting each other's classrooms. They still feel part of a teaching/learning community. Faculty have also gotten involved in other staff development activities at the College.

The Institute (Before, During, and After) had an impact on twelve faculty members, and they in turn have impacted, as a group, on approximately 1500 students a semester and continue to do so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - SUMMER CONTENT INSTITUTE 1988

Bazerman, C. (1980). A Relationship Between Reading and Writing: The Conversational Model. College English, 41, 656-661.

Bean, J. C., Drenk, D., & Lee, F. D. (1982). Microtheme Strategies for Developing Cognitive Skills. In C. W. Griffin (Ed.), Teaching Writing in All Disciplines (pp. 27-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative Learning and the "Conversation of Mankind." College English, 46, 635-652.

Buchanan, N. K. (1986). Assigned Reading Activity: An Alternative to Lecture/Discussion. College Teaching, 34, 111- 113.

Dillon, J. T. (1984) Research on Questioning and Discussion. Educational Leadership, November, 50-56.

Eckert, E. K. (1988). The Day I Realized the Game Was Over. Chronicle of Higher Education, May, A-48.

Frederick, P. J. (1986). The Lively Lecture - 8 Variations. College Teaching, 34, 43-50.

Griffin, M. D. (1988). The Teacher-Artist. Boston College Magazine, Spring, 32-35.

Herrington, A. J. (1981). Writing to Learn: Writing across the Disciplines. College English, 43, 379-387.

Irwin, J. W., & Davis, C. A. (1980). Assessing Readability: The Checklist Approach. Journal of Reading, 24, 124-130.

Kasulis, T. P. (1984). Questioning. In M. M. Gullette (Ed.), The Art and Craft of Teaching (pp. 38-48). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Langer, J. A. (1982). Facilitating Text Processing: The Elaboration of Prior Knowledge. In J. A. Langer & M. T. Smith-Burke (Eds.), Reader Meets Author / Bridging the Gap (pp. 149-162). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Maimon, E. P. (1982). Writing across the Curriculum: Past, Present, and Future. In C. W. Griffin (Ed.), Teaching Writing in All Disciplines (pp. 27-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

MacAllister, J. (1982). Responding to Student Writing. In C. W. Griffin (Ed.), Teaching Writing in All Disciplines (pp. 59-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McNeil, J. (1987) Restructuring Schemata. In Reading Comprehension (pp. 67-90). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Nist, S. L., & Kirby, K. (1986). Teaching Comprehension and Study Strategies through Modeling and Thinking Aloud. Reading Research and Instruction, 25, 254-264.

Odell, L. (1980). The Process of Writing and the Process of Learning. College Composition and Communication, 31, 42-50.

Page, H. W. (1988). Literature across the Curriculum. Journal of Reading, 31, 520-523.

Richardson, R. C., Fisk, E. C., & Okun, M. A. (1983). Literacy in the Open-Access College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rowe, M. B. (1987). Wait Time: Slowing Down May be a Way of Speeding Up. American Educator, Spring, 38-43.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1981). Schemata: Building Blocks fo Cognition. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Comprehension and Teaching: Research Reviews (pp. 3-26). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Sternberg, R. J. (1987). Teaching Critical Thinking: Eight Easy Ways to Fail Before You Begin. Phi Delta Kappan, February, 456-459.

Weinstein, C. E., & Rogers, B. T. (1985). Comprehension Monitoring: The Neglected Learning Strategy. Journal of Developmental Education, 9, 6-29.

Wiggins, G. (1987). Creating a Thought-Provoking Curriculum. American Educator, Winter, 10-17.